

Amendments to the Drawings

In response to the Office Action a new drawing sheet has been added showing new Fig. 7. Fig. 7 shows "when a soleplate is not in contact with the support surface." Support for this can be found in the Substitute Specification on page 14, line 8 to 17 for example. No new matter has been added.

Attachment: One New Drawing Sheet

REMARKS

The drawings were objected to under 37 CFR 1.83(a). Claims 12 to 21 and 23 to 25 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. Claim 23 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Claims 12 to 17, 24 and 25 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Japanese Patent No. 3044121 to Kinoshita (hereinafter “Kinoshita”) in view of Japanese Publication No. 10-88857 to Fujikura Ltd. (hereinafter “Fujikura”) and U.S. Patent No. 2,014,643 to Bakker (hereinafter “Bakker”). Claims 18 to 21 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Kinoshita in view of Fujikura and Bakker and further in view of Japanese Publication No. 64-43643 to Tokiko Ltd. (hereinafter “Tokiko”). Claim 23 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Kinoshita in view of Fujikura, Bakker and Tokiko and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,244,015 to Ito et al. (hereinafter “Ito”).

Claim 12 has been amended to more clearly and particularly define the invention. Support for these amendments can be found in the substitute specification on page 11, lines 23 to 25, page 14, lines 8 to 17, and previously presented claim 18, for example. Claim 18 has been canceled.

Reconsideration of the application based on the foregoing amendments and the following remarks is respectfully requested.

Interview Summary

Applicant’s representative Danielle Sullivan (Reg. No. 64,125) and Examiner Schwartz conducted a telephonic interview on February 1, 2011, and Applicant’s representative thanks Examiner Schwartz for his time and comments. The rejections under 112 were discussed regarding the term “support pad” and the limitation “when the soleplate is not in contact with the support surface.” The Examiner suggested amending claim 12 to clarify that the “support pad” is not a separate element. Applicants thank the Examiner for his time. No final agreement was reached.

Drawings

The drawings were objected to under 37 CFR 1.83(a). The Office Action asserts ““the support pad and the added limitation on line 16 must be shown or the features canceled from the claim.””

The term “support pad” in the claim limitations has been amended. Furthermore, the drawings do show antiseismic support pad 8 and the components which comprise the antiseismic support pad 8. Figure 2 shows antiseismic support pad 8 in an installation. Figures 3, 4, 5 and 6 show antiseismic support pad 8 in more detail showing the components that comprise the support pad in its entirety.

The limitation “when a soleplate is not in contact with the support surface,” can now been seen in new drawing, Figure 7.

Withdrawal of the objection of the drawings is respectfully requested.

§112 Rejections

Claims 12 to 21 and 23 to 25 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement.

The Office Action asserts “claim 12 remains unclear exactly what applicant’s consider the ‘support pad’ to be since numeral 8 is a general designation only and does not appear to represent any structure that resembles a ‘pad.’”

Per the discussion with the Examiner, claim 12 has been amended to more clearly define what comprises the antiseismic support pad. The term “support pad” has been removed from the cited claim limitation.

The Office Action further asserts that “when the soleplate is not in contact with the surface” is not found in the specification and conflicts with what is claimed on lines 3 and 4. This limitation can be found in the Substitute Specification on page 5, line 25 to page 6, line 5, for example. Furthermore, the claim has been amended to more clearly define this limitation.

Withdrawal of the rejection to claims 12 to 21 and 23 to 25 under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph is respectfully requested.

Claim 23 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. The Office Action asserts “[r]egarding claim 23 it is unclear what the applicant's are relying upon for patentability.” Claim 23 recites a method for installing an installation, the method including the limitations recite in the claim.

Withdrawal of the rejection to the claim 23 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph is respectfully requested.

§103 Rejections

Claims 12 to 17, 24 and 25 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Kinoshita in view of Fujikura and Bakker.

Kinoshita discloses a quakeproof pedestal for bibelots such as vases or plates.

Fujikura discloses a quake absorbing structure “comprising a support plate 8 fixed to an architecture 4, a ball 10, and a ball retainer 12 fixed to the base 2.” (English Abstract).

Bakker discloses a balance block for buildings consisting “of an upper bearing member 3 suitably rigidly secured to the sill 2 and a lower bearing member 4 suitably rigidly secured to the building foundation 10. The upper and lower bearing blocks 3 and 4 are formed with opposed inner concave surfaces 5 and 6, respectively, which form a pocket 7 within which is positioned a bearing ball 8 adapted, in conjunction with a suitable number of other like bearing balls positioned at intervals in like sets of bearing members around the foundation 10.” (Page 1, col. 2, lines 5 to 15).

Claim 12 has been amended to include the limitation of claim 18 and now recites in part “wherein the support plate comprises a top portion having a form of a bushing having an axis on the support plate axis, the bushing internally tapped over at least a fraction of its length and including a guide slot opening out in an outer side surface and extending parallel to the axis of the support plate, the antiseismic pad further comprising an actuation shaft having a threaded portion engaged by screw-fastening in the tapped portion of the bushing of

the plate along the axis of the plate, and at least one guide and engagement part in which the shaft is mounted to rotate about the axis of the support plate and secured in translation with the at least one guide part including a guide element having a guide peg inserted in the slot of the bushing of the plate for guiding the plate in axial translation, whereby turning the shaft secured in axial translation with at least one engagement and guide part so as to screw it in or out relative to the tapped opening of the bushing of the plate, causes the engagement and guide part to move in translation along the axis of the plate relative to the support plate.”

Kinoshita, Fujikura and Bakker all fail to teach or show the newly added limitations of previous claim 18. Therefore withdrawal of the rejection of claims 12 to 17, 24 and 25 in view of Kinoshita, Fujikura and Bakker is respectfully requested.

Claims 18 to 21 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Kinoshita in view of Fujikura and Bakker and further in view of Tokiko.

Kinoshita, Fujikura and Bakker are discussed above.

Tokiko discloses a quake absorbing device comprising a nut attached to a bottom part of electronic device and a bolt threaded to the nut.

The limitation of claim 18 has been added to independent claim 12. Claim 18 has been canceled. Claim 12 now recites in part “wherein the support plate comprises a top portion having a form of a bushing having an axis on the support plate axis, the bushing internally tapped over at least a fraction of its length and including a guide slot opening out in an outer side surface and extending parallel to the axis of the support plate, the antiseismic pad further comprising an actuation shaft having a threaded portion engaged by screw-fastening in the tapped portion of the bushing of the plate along the axis of the plate, and at least one guide and engagement part in which the shaft is mounted to rotate about the axis of the support plate and secured in translation with the at least one guide part including a guide element having a guide peg inserted in the slot of the bushing of the plate for guiding the plate in axial translation, whereby turning the shaft secured in axial translation with at least one engagement and guide part so as to screw it in or out relative to the tapped opening of the

bushing of the plate, causes the engagement and guide part to move in translation along the axis of the plate relative to the support plate.”

The Examiner concedes that Kinoshita, Fujikura and Bakker fail to teach or show the limitations of previously presented claim 18. The Examiner asserts on page 5 of the Office Action that Tokiko “is relied upon to teach an antisismic support pad arrangement at 18 combined with guide peg arrangement at 9, 15 and transportable installation 6, 8a.” However this does not teach all limitations of previously presented claim 18 and the Applicants fail to see where in Tokiko a bushing includes “a guide slot opening out in an outer side surface and extending parallel to the axis of the support plate,” or “turning the shaft secured in axial translation with at least one engagement and guide part so as to screw it in or out relative to the tapped opening of the bushing of the plate.” Furthermore, the Examiner fails to address in the Office Action where such limitations can be found in Tokiko. Therefore withdrawal of the rejection of claims 18 to 21 is respectfully requested.

Claim 23 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Kinoshita in view of Fujikura, Bakker and Tokiko and further in view of Ito.

Claim 23 indirectly depends on claim 12. Therefore in light of the discussion above regarding claim 12, withdrawal of the rejection to claim 23 is respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

It is respectfully submitted that the application is in condition for allowance and applicants respectfully request such action.

If any additional fees are deemed to be due at this time, the Assistant Commissioner is authorized to charge payment of the same to Deposit Account No. 50-0552.

Respectfully submitted,
DAVIDSON, DAVIDSON & KAPPEL, LLC

By: _____
Cary S. Kappel (Reg. No. 36,561)

DATED: February 9, 2011

Davidson, Davidson & Kappel, LLC
485 Seventh Avenue, 14th Floor
New York, New York 10018
(212) 736-1940